

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to Bahrs (hereinafter Bahrs). The Examiner stated that Bahrs teaches a method or computer program of correctly ordering test code for testing software components. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. A careful review of Bahrs reveals that Bahrs teaches several different functions. Among the functions disclosed by Bahrs is: a method of creating a graphical user interface including a plurality of components, a method and apparatus for refreshing data in an application, a method and apparatus for displaying a component or a container, a process for managing services in a desktop environment, a method and apparatus for managing transactions, a method and apparatus for displaying a graphical user interface, a method and apparatus for performing validation of a user input, a method and apparatus for managing permissions in an application, a method and apparatus for presenting a view to a client, a method and apparatus for processing user input, a method and apparatus for presenting a set of screens in a graphical user interface, a method and apparatus for serializing data, a method and apparatus for providing an interface to an application for monitoring execution of the application, and a method and apparatus for accessing classes and methods in an object-oriented system. Despite all of the teachings of Bahrs, Bahrs none the less fails to disclose or suggest generating test code for testing a software component, utilizing a software diagramming tool to provide a sequence diagram of the software component and ordering the test code in accordance with the sequence diagram.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 are believed allowable over Bahrs. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claims 1 or 6 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/975,568
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2003

Docket No. EMPIR-025AUS

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Respectfully submitted,

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: David W. Rouille
David W. Rouille
Reg. No. 40,150
Attorney for Applicant(s)
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2354
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, ext. 25
Fax: (781) 401-9966

Dated: 20-Jan-04